REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 14, 20, 25-27 and 29 have been amended, and claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 6, 14, 27 and 29 have been amended to overcome this rejection and removal the rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoover et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,575) (hereinafter "Hoover"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 1, **Hoover fails to disclose an identity index that includes a virtual identity _for a user of multiple computer resources_.** Claim 1 recites that the virtual identity includes, for each information object, a resource name identifying one of the multiple computer resources at which said respective information object is located. **Thus, claim 1 requires a _virtual identity for a user of multiple computer resources_, that includes, for each information object, a resource name that identifies one of the multiple computer resources (used by the user) _at which the respective information object is located_.**

In contrast, Hoover teaches a system in which data regarding various subjects, such as patients of a health care system. Hoover's system overlays a homogenous data model over multiple, heterogeneous, remote data collections and provides an object broker that stores location and status information regarding the remote data. Hoover's

system allows users access to new data sources as they come online, without requiring the users (or the users' computers) to know the routing address or other identifying information about the new data source.

Hoover's system does not include a virtual identity **for a user of multiple computer resources at which the respective information objects are located.** Hoover describes his system using an exemplary health care system. The data stored in the system relates to the patients of the system, not to a user of multiple computer resources. In Hoover, the users of the computer resources where the information objects are located are the employees of the health care service providers and insurance companies that are collecting and using the data on the remote computers (Hoover, column 27, lines 25-55; column 45, line 46 – column 46, line 19; and column 47, line 55 – column 48, line 3). However, the alleged virtual identities in Hoover do not correspond to these users.

For example, Hoover describes an example in which a new record is added for a person in a remote database by using an add_PERSON message. The add_PERSON message may include a security password of the computer user initiating the new record. Hoover specifically states that the MyPassword parameter of the add_PERSON message "indicates a security password for the user initiating the operation, *which is of course unrelated to the information associated with the person whose demographics are being added*" (Emphasis added, Hoover, column 29, lines 46-57). Thus, Hoover explicitly teaches that the user of the resources (the data sources on the remote computers) is **not** the person that is associated with any particular object identity or object attribute. Therefore, Hoover's system does not include, nor does Hoover disclose, a virtual identity for a user of one or more resources and that includes a resource name, for each information object, that identifies one of the one or more resources (used by the user) at which the respective information object is located, as recited in Applicants' claim.

The rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 20 and 26.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-96802/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: August 10, 2007